CA2ALAH
73A66
C.2

CA2 ALAH 1973A66
Approach to Provincial Involvement in a
Program of Neighbourhood Improveme 2
3 3398 00306 9498

UP
VAULT 19

SEP 28 1975
EDMONTON

Alberta Housing Corporation.
An approach to Provincial
Involvement in a Program of
Neighbourhood Improvement.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026 with funding from
Legislative Assembly of Alberta - Alberta Legislature Library

ALBERTA HOUSING CORPORATION

An Approach to Provincial Involvement in a Program of Neighbourhood Improvement.

LIBRARY
VAULT 19

Prepared by: D. Earl
Urban Planner
December, 1973

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026 with funding from
University of Alberta Library

https://archive.org/details/ableg_33398003069498

CONTENTS

	Page
Preface	i.
Recommendations	ii.
Section A: Alternative Approaches to Provincial Involvement in a Program of Neighbourhood Rehabilitation.	1.
Alternative "A": J.W.Long & Assoc. Proposal	5.
Alternative "B": Annual Provincial Grant Approach	7.
Alternative "C": Middle of the Road Approach	9.
Comparative Eight Year Cost for Alternatives.	10.
Section B: Guidelines for Participation in Neighbourhood Improvement.	14.
Section C: Neighbourhood Improvement Signing and Approving Authority	16.
Section D: Part 1. Request for Contributions - City of Calgary for Inglewood/ Ramsay Neighbourhood.	17.
Part II. Proposed 1974 Provincial Contribution to Inglewood/ Ramsay Neighbourhood Improvement Program.	24.

PREFACE

Events of the past week such as the submission of an application by the City of Calgary for a Certificate of Eligibility for the Planning Stage under the Neighbourhood Improvement Program as well as a further submission requesting a specific level of cost sharing contribution from the Alberta Housing Corporation has required the drawing together the following material.

To give consistency to the material presented in this submission the report received by the Board members on November 23, 1973 dealing with alternative approaches to provincial involvement in NIP is reproduced as Section A. Two minor changes have been made. Due to inconsistancies the following sentence on Page 10 has been deleted:

> "Accordingly, a realistic 1974 allocation for Alternative "C" would be approximately $800 thousand for the province over a three year period."

On page 12 - "Note 1" has been added to give further meaning to the Eight Year Alternative Cost Estimates.

Section B sets out a series of guidelines for participation in NIP based on a form of provincial involvement as outlined in Alternative "B" of the above mentioned report.

Section C provides a statement as to signing and approving authority in order to administer the program.

Section D consists of two parts, the first is a request from the City of Calgary for contributions from AHC for the Inglewood/Ramsey neighbourhood. The second part outlines the proposed level of provincial contribution to Inglewood/Ramsay neighbourhood based on the program proposed by this report.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. This motion was approved by the Board November 23, 1973 and is included to add coherence to the other recommendations:

> "That the Board of Directors of Alberta Housing Corporation considers Neighbourhood Improvement Program to be of high priority and strongly recommends to Cabinet that the Provincial Government participate financially in the Neighbourhood Improvement Program."

The approval of the following three recommendations is needed to operationalize NIP in the province.

2. That the "guidelines" as contained on page 14 be approved as the basis of provincial involvement in the Neighbourhood Improvement Program.

3. That the signing and approving authority as contained on Page 16 be adopted.

4. That a grant of $150,000 be made available to the City of Calgary for the year 1974 to be used in the Inglewood/Ramsay Neighbourhood and in a manner consistant with the guidelines as contained on page 14 of this report.

SECTION A: ALTERNATIVE APPROACHES TO PROVINCIAL INVOLVEMENT IN A PROGRAM OF NEIGHBOURHOOD REHABILITATION

INTRODUCTION:

Rehabilitation has been defined as follows:

> "Rehabilitation refers to the process of restoration or improvement of dwelling units either singly or in groups, up to or above some minimum standard. As it relates to government housing and urban policy, this can include not only the rehabilitation of the dwelling unit itself, but also, where necessary, improvement to community facilities and services that are needed either to ensure that dwelling units rehabilitated will be maintained or to stimulate private rehabilitation of dwelling units." [1]

Thus, it is in this context that the Alberta Government should approach the problem of aging structures and communities throughout the province. In the past, provincial and federal policies with regard to housing have reflected a bias toward new construction and redevelopment and have for the most part neglected the fact that existing structures represent the country's greatest material and financial investment.

It is claimed by some that from the day a house is completed it begins to deteriorate. This may be so but it must also be recognized that regular maintenance and occasional renovations can guarantee the usefulness of a house well beyond the life of the original owner.

One of the elements of municipal taxation is the evaluation of property based on a yearly depreciation factor which is a rather meaningless exercise when compared with the fact that over the past 10 years housing in Alberta has appreciated on an average of 5 to 10 per cent each year.

---

[1] Peter Barnard and Associates, Rehabilitation as an approach to Housing and Urban Problems, November 1971 p. 2.

The cost of housing continues to accelerate out of the range of low and moderate wage earners however, there are areas within the larger cities and in parts of rural Alberta where low cost housing is still available but is not being taken advantage of. Some of th e reasons why this situation exists are as follows:

1. Restrictions on Mortgage lending due to:

   a) Instability of an area due to uncertainty of future land use.

   b) Condition of surrounding structures results in high "risk factor".

   c) Declining area population and low housing demand result in high "risk factor".

2. High mortgage interest rates make it impossible for low income people to compete in the housing market even if they are able to find less expensive housing.

3. In many cases unless renovations are carried out on older homes their life expectancy will not meet the terms of a 25 to 30 year mortgage.

4. Lack of community school and recreation facilities tends to limit the areas desirableness for families with young children.

5. Older areas now face the costly problem of either replacement or installation of local services. The placement of these charges on the property taxes are an added expense that people in these areas can ill afford.

This list is by no means complete, however, it does show that a combined problem exists in maintaining an inventory of good low cost housing units, whether old or new, as well as providing flexibility within mortgage and rental procedures that allow access to this housing by the low to moderate income families in our society. In order to do this action must be taken at the municipal level to introduce stability and a feeling of confidence into older areas in order to

counteract the private development sectors wish to create instability for the purpose of clearance and redevelopment. The intention is not to condemn all redevelopment but to indicate the need for redevelopment within the constraints of an overall neighbourhood improvement plan and not to encourage the mass exodus of a neighbourhood population as a result of insecurity and speculation.

Examples in the United States over the past decade has shown that the willingness of the property owners to invest in the rehabilitation of their buildings is strongly influenced by their perception of the surrounding community, including the nature of its inhabitants, the condition of their buildings and the services and facilities provided to it by the municipality and other agencies. These same factors influence the occupants and owners of the improved units in regard to carrying out the needed on-going maintenance work to ensure that the rehabilitation "sticks", that the unit will not deteriorate back to its former state."

"Thus, government rehabilitation programs must consider the improvements needed in community facilities, including parks, roads, water supply, sewers, lighting and street landscaping in order to stimulate private rehabilitation and ensure that adequate maintenance is carried out. Equally, if not more important may be the upgrading of such community services as police and fire protection, education, garbage collection and street maintenance, social counselling, public day care services, and so on."[2].

On the basis of this argument it then becomes academic as to whether the environment and amenities surrounding housing is more or less important than the

---

2. ibd pp.4-5

housing itself. The point is that one cannot be separated from the other and in order to implement a policy to conserve and maintain low income housing areas; funds must also be made available to eliminate those elements within the community that are contributing to residential deterioration. It is for this reason that the province through the Alberta Housing Corporation should become involved: A neighbourhood is made up of amenities, people and housing, and housing without the other two ingredients does not last long.

While the United States has been involved with rehabilitation and neighbourhood improvement for 15 years the Canadian experience is very limited. The Strathcona Rehabilitation Project in Vancouver has been operating for 2 years and appears to be successful. The cities of Montreal and Toronto have been operating their own rehabilitation programs over the past 2 years but indications are that they will be "plugging" into the new federal programs as soon as they are available. As there is virtually no example to follow in terms of provincial involvement, all that can be done is to decide on a course of action and then work out the details and modify the program as it progresses.

Alternative Provincial Funding Approaches

Inherent to the alternative provincial funding approaches to be outlined below are the following common requirements that should be part of whichever program is adopted.

1. Positive provincial control in terms of intergovernmental cash flow and program administration. In other words every effort should be made to facilitate the program at the municipal level by simplifying rules and procedures. Also, all

funds provided to the municipality by the federal government will flow through the province. In this way the municipalities will only have to maintain one set of records and deal with one government agency.

2. Program administration to be the responsibility of the Alberta Housing Corporation.

3. Program co-ordination with other provincial departments and agencies to be the responsibility of the Alberta Housing Corporation and the Office of Program Co-ordination.

4. For the 1975 Provincial budget and each succeeding year thereafter, pertinent provincial department programs to be co-ordinated with designated rehabilitation areas in an effort to focus resources to maximize results.

Alternative A: J. W. Long and Associates Proposal

The firm, J. W. Long and Associates, was retained by the Alberta Housing Corporation in September, 1973 to prepare a report on the role and capabilities of the three levels of government, as well as community groups to meet program criteria as spelled out in the National Housing Act as well as in the Alberta Provincial/Federal NIP Agreement. This report was presented to Alberta Housing Corporation's Board of Directors on October 19, 1973.

An analysis of Mr. Long's proposal is as follows:

For illustrative purposes, we will assume a $4,000 federal grant. As this is a cost sharing program, in order to utilize the total $4000 the Provincial and Municipal governments would have to contribute in the following manner:

Cost Sharing Activities	Federal		Provincial		Municipal		Total $
	%	$	%	$	%	$	
1. Neighbourhood Selections	50	500	50	500	-		1000
2. Neighbourhood Planning	50	500	-		50	500	1000
3. Citizen Participation	50	500	-		50	500	1000
4. Soc. & Rec. Land & Facil.	50	500	50	500	-		1000
5. Relocation	50	500	50	500	-		1000
6. Administration	50	500	-		50	500	1000
7. Services & Utilities	25	500	25	500	50	1000	2000
8. Relocation of Non-conforming uses	25	500	25	500	50	1000	2000
Total $		4000		2500		3500	10,000

Caution is advised with regard to the interpretation of this diagram however three observations are in order which indicate the shortcomings of this approach.

1. Cost sharing activities 1, 4 and 5 could be over-emphasized by the municipalities in order to take advantage of provincial grants while items 2,3,6,7 and 8 could be neglected to the detriment of the program.

2. A further examination of this proposal reveals that the majority of municipal involvement is in the area of staffing and administration. Traditionally, municipalities "shy" away from programs that call for high staffing costs. They are more inclined to approve items that will produce physical results on the ground.

3. A further disadvantage of this proposal is its overall high cost with regard to municipal involvement to the extent of just about matching the federal contribution. If a municipality is willing to accept this degree of involvement, well and good, but if such involvement interferes with the operation of other essential city services, the municipality may just as easily solve the problems of deterioration through rezoning and redevelopment.

Alternative B: Annual Provincial Grant Approach

This approach has been advocated by some municipalities for a number of years and to a limited degree is similar to the funding procedure used by the province under the urban renewal program.

This approach would provide an annual grant to a municipality to be applied to a designated neighbourhood rehabilitation area and would complement the federal grant. Unlike the federal contribution, the provincial grant would have no other conditions placed on it other than the following:

1. The grant must be used only for a designated neighbourhood rehabilitation area.
2. It should apply on projects and programs of direct benefit to the area residents.
3. It must be used in neighbourhoods where residential rehabilitation is to be a part of the program.

The administration of this program would simply require the municipality to gain approval from the Alberta Housing Corporation for the projects it wishes to support. Once the approval is given, the municipality can proceed by submitting receipts for reimbursement at regular intervals to the limit of the grant. In this way the province would retain control over the expenditure of the grant; and at the same time, allow the municipality flexibility to apply the funds to areas of high priority, whether inside or outside of the cost sharing categories of the federal program.

Some of the advantages of this approach are:

i. No detailed auditing procedures required to make sure that every dollar is spent only on eligible items.

ii. It allows the municipality the choice of applying the funds to the cost of those items shared by the federal governments, or to pay for additional items that are not shared by the federal government but are of benefit to the community.

iii. It allows one more dimension of flexibility to the program, that of allowing the municipality the right to make the decision to stay within the federal program or to go beyond it.

iv. It allows for the province to provide grants on a yearly basis rather than to be locked into a 3 year cost sharing arrangement. In this way the province can regulate its involvement according to a yearly program of need and demand.

v. The province is allowed the flexibility to examine the rehabilitation program of each neighbourhood and provide grants at the level deemed necessary to affect desired results.

The flexibility of this approach allows the provincial government to contribute at any level deemed desirable. A reasonable guideline would be grants equal to approximately 25 percent of the program cost.

Alternative C: Middle of the Road Approach

This alternative is referred to as the middle of the road approach because it is a compromise between not contributing to the program at all and sharing program costs on a 50/50 basis. On the whole this program calls for approximately a 30% involvement on the part of the provincial government and a 20% involvement from the municipal government.[3]

Unlike alternative "A" this approach focuses on the cost sharing of particular improvement items that are generally high cost and the payment of which usually falls on the property owner. These items are basic to neighbourhood rehabilitation and include such things as, street paving, lighting, water systems and sewers, sidewalks and the elimination of noxiousland uses.

Alternative "A" is broken down so that the cost of particular items fall largely on either the province or the municipality. This proposal differs in that committment to and cost sharing of the total program falls fairly evenly on all three governments and is based on each governments capacity to pay.

The approach also emphasizes the role of citizen participation by indicating a 40% cost sharing of this activity by the province.

Once again, for illustrative purposes, we will assume a $4,000 federal grant and compare the provincial/municipal input.

---

3. Note: On November 14,1973 the writer was in contact with the Ontario Housing Corporation and their recommendation to the Ontario Government is that the Province share 25% and the municipality 25%.

Cost Sharing Activities	Federal		Provincial		Municipal		Total $
	%	$	%	$	%	$	
1. Neighbourhood Selection	50	500	30	300	20	200	1000
2. Neighbourhood Planning	50	500	30	300	20	200	1000
3. Citizen Participation	50	500	40	400	10	100	1000
4. Soc. & Rec. Land & Facil.	50	500	25	250	25	250	1000
5. Relocation	50	500	25	250	25	250	1000
6. Administration	50	500	30	300	20	200	1000
7. Services & Utilities	25	500	50	1000	25	500	2000
8. Relocation of Non-conforming uses	25	500	50	1000	25	500	2000
Total $		4000		3800		2200	10,000

The involvement under this proposal is a 40:38:22 percentage ratio split between the federal, provincial and municipal governments as compared to Alternative A which had a 40:25:35 split.

The provincial involvement is higher in Alternative "C" than it is in Alternative "A" however, the municipal involvement in Alternative "C" is reduced by approximately one third. The increased cost in this alternative is due primarily to the 50% provincial involvement in Services and Utilities.

Comparative Eight Year Cost for Alternatives

The following eight year estimate of provincial involvement in the 3 alternatives is based on the assumption that there will be a demand for neighbourhood rehabilitation throughout the coming years and that municipalities will be able to marshal their resources to utilize the funds. Unless this happens the funds may go unused even though they are available.

Section 27.7 of the National Housing Act states:

"No application for a contribution or loan may be approved under this part after the 31st day of March, 1978.".

Thus, NIP is a five year program ending in 1978. The time allowed for the implementation of neighbourhood programs is 3 years. Therefore, the implementation of projects approved in 1978 will carry on until 1980. Even though the "ball park" estimates given below are only realistic for perhaps the first two years the eight year sequence will show how the overlapping of the implementation effects budget requirements.

The estimates are based on an assumed yearly federal allocation of $2,750,000. Thus over the 5 year life time of the program the total federal contribution to Alberta would be $13;750,000.

EIGHT YEAR ALTERNATIVE COST ESTIMATES

Year Alternatives	1973-74	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980	Total
Alternative "A" 25%[1].	460,000	920,000	1,380,000	1,380,000	1,380,000	920,000	460,000	6,900,000
Alternative "B" * 10% - 50%[1].	Low.92,000 High920,000	184,000 1,840,000	276,000 2,760,000	276,000 2,760,000	276,000 2,760,000	184,000 1,840,000	92,000 920,000	1,380,000 13,800,000
Alternative "C" 38%[1].	770,000	1,540,000	2,310,000	2,310,000	2,310,000	1,540,000	770,000	11,550,000

* Note: Contributions under this alternative could range anywhere from 10% to 50% depending on provincial policy and budgetary constraints

1. Note: NIP is a cost sharing program. No one item is paid for 100% by the federal government. Therefore in order to utilize the $2,750,000 granted to Alberta for 1974 the Municipality(ies) and/or the Province will have to provide an additional $2,750,000+. The federal government will not contribute at a level greater than 50% of the cost of any one item.

4. The municipality is to use the federal contribution on items provided for in Bill C-133 of the National Housing Act.

5. The provincial contribution is to be used in designated neighbourhood improvement areas where residential rehabilitation is to be a part of the improvement program.

6. The provincial contribution is to assist in the provision of programs and facilities of direct benefit to NIP area residents. Thus the municipality will have the flexibility of applying the provincial contribution directly to the cost sharing items supported by the federal program or of applying it to programs and projects that do not fall within the federal program.

7. AHC will be responsible for the co-ordination of staff and financial resource input into the program by other provincial departments. This could most easily be accomplished by the establishment of an interdepartmental review and co-ordinating team made up initially of representatives from the Departments of Culture Youth and Recreation; Health and Social Development; Municipal Affairs, Highways and Transport Treasury, Education and Environment.

8. Application for Neighbourhood improvement funding at the selection, planning and implementation stages are to be made to AHC.

9. Federal and provincial funds for neighbourhood improvement will be made available to municipalities by AHC upon receipt of documentation of expenditures.

10. Municipalities are to maintain current and accurate financial records to allow for quarterly audits by the province.

Section C: Neighbourhood Improvement Signing and Approving Authority.

In order to expedite the administration of NIP in the province the following signing and approving authority should be agreed upon.

Board of Directors: are to approve the designation of municipalities within the province that are to receive federal funding under NIP as well as the level of funding allocated to each area.

Approve the level of provincial contribution to each neighbourhood improvement area.

Assistant Executive Director: is to approve and sign "Certificates of Eligibility" for the three stages of program implementation: 1. Selection 2. Planning 3. Implementation.

Approve projects and programs eligible for funding under the provincial neighbourhood improvement grant.

Approve the forwarding of federal and provincial program funds to municipalities upon submission of accounts of expenditures.

Section D: Part I. Request for Contributions - City of Calgary for Inglewood/Ramsay Neighbourhood

The following material was submitted to AHC by the City of Calgary Planning Department and is self-explanatory.

It should be noted that the cost sharing arrangement proposed by Calgary is similar to Alternative "A" as contained in Section "A" of this report.

It is our current understanding via Mr. Darwin Earl of Alberta Housing Corporation that this material will be placed before the December 18, 1973 Alberta Housing Corporation Board Meeting for consideration and decision.

Yours truly,

L. Hallett,
Manager,
HOUSING & URBAN RENEWAL.

LH:ap Lyle D. Hallett

c.c. to Commissioner D.H. Cole
c.c. to G. Steber, Jr.

C.124 RE: INGLEWOOD/RAMSAY N.I.P. - STAGES II AND III
APPLICATION FOR CERTIFICATES OF ELIGIBILITY

Council designated Inglewood/Ramsay as its first N.I.P. on May 28, 1973. At a meeting on July 16, 1973, in Edmonton, the Federal Minister of Urban Affairs, Mr Basford the Minister of Municipal Affairs, Mr D. Russell, and the Mayors of the Cities of Edmonton and Calgary set out the terms of reference for the N.I.P. for both cities.

The Alberta Housing Corporation has subsequently advised the City that Federal funds will be made available to Calgary in the amount of $1,030,000 in contributions, and $470,000 in loans for the implementation of the Inglewood/Ramsay Community Plan. The Federal contributions must be matched by contributions from either the Provincial Government or the City or a combination thereof. The Provincial Government has not indicated that it will participate at this time.

The Planning Department and other Civic Departments have worked closely with both Community Associations, C.M.H.C., and A.H.C., to establish their tentative financial Plan. To assist in the establishment of the community's priorities, the Redevelopment Centre has since August 22, 1973 been the focus for meetings, information collection, dissemination, etc.

Ramsay has begun work on its Design Brief which it is anticipated will be completed in two month's time.

RECOMMENDATION:

(1) That Council approve application to the Senior Governments by the City of Calgary for a Certificate of Eligibility for Stage II of the Neighborhood Improvement Program.

(2) That Council agree to share equally with the Federal Government the interim financing required to operate the Inglewood/Ramsay Redevelopment Centre until December 31, 1973, as well as for the preparation of Ramsay's Design Brief. The City of Calgary's share would be approximately $13,900.00 in cash or services.

(3) That the cost sharing tentatively proposed to the Alberta Housing Corporation by the City Administration in September, 1973 be accepted by City Council and that Council's decision be forwarded to the Alberta Housing Corporation for consideration by its Board of Directors (see Attachments A and B).

(4) That the Administration of Funds and the hiring of full time personnel, as well as the obtaining of any outside services to complete the Preliminary Studies, be under the control of the City of Calgary, the Provincial and Federal Governments and the Inglewood/Ramsay Community Associations.

ACTION RECOMMENDED: Approval of the above recommendations.

ATTACHMENT

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

THE CITY OF CALGARY
CITY CLERK'S DEPARTMENT

(Sheet 1 of 1)

TO: Director of Planning

COPIES TO: Director of Finance

DECISION OF CITY COUNCIL

November 21st, 1973

EXTRACT FROM Commissioners' Report,

dated November 14th, 1973,

dealt with by City Council at its meeting on November 19th, 1973,

and adopted.

"That Clause C.124 of the Report of the Commissioners, dated November 14th, 1973, Re. Inglewood/Ramsay N.I.P. - Stages II and III Application for Certificates of Eligibility, be adopted, as amended."

Copy of Clause C.124, as amended, attached.

C.M.H.C., Alta. Housing Corp., Minister of Municipal Affairs and Minister of Urban Affairs advised.
Inglewood/Ramsay Community Associations also advised.

ATTACHMENT A

PHASE III - PRELIMINARY FINANCIAL IMPLEMENTATION BUDGET - NEIGHBOURHOOD IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM - INGLEWOOD/RAMSAY

	Gross Cost	Recovery or Other Contributions	Net Cost	Actual Split N.I.P.Fed. Share	Suggested Split N.I.P. Provincial Share	Suggested Split N.I.P. Municipal Share
1. & 2. Preselection Planning and Administration	196,500		*196,500	50% 98,250		50% 98,250
3. Property for Open Space	979,000	425,000	554,000	50% 277,000	25% 138,500	25% 138,500
4. Property for Housing	660,000	297,480	362,520	50% 181,260	50% 181,260	
5. Community Facilities Loan	1,505,000 110,000	850,000	655,000	50% 327,500 110,000	25% 163,750	25% 163,750
6. Commercial Improvements Loan	240,000			240,000		
7. Housing Relocation						
** 8. Local Improvements	1,226,265	802,216	424,049	138,416	138,416	147,217
9. Industrial Relocation	524,000	482,000	42,000	25% 10,500	50% 21,000	25% 10,500
Total	5,090,765	2,856,696	2,234,069	1,032,926	642,926	558,217 (refer to report item C 1.
(Loans)	350,000			350,000		

*This figure represents a 28-month budget from August 1973 to December 31, 1975 but has not yet been endorsed by the Community Association or the City.

**These figures are very preliminary and require reconsideration and detailed investigation by the community Association and the Administration with respect to which of the projects would properly be covered by N.I.P. funds; regular local improvement financing and/or more properly allocated to City capital works programs proposed in the area. Any dollars eliminated from this portion of the program would be reallocated elsewhere.

NEIGHBOURHOOD IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM PERCENTAGE COST SHARING COMPARISONS

	*Federal Share	Suggested Split of Matching Funds		
		Province	City	Resident
1. & 2. Preselection, selection, planning & Administration	50%		50%	-
3. Property of open space	50	25	25	-
4. Property for housing	50	50		-
5. Community Facilities	50	25	25	-
6. Commercial Improvements		Federal Loans		-
7. Housing relocation	50	50		-
8. Local Improvements	25	25	25	25
9. Industrial relocation	25	50	25	-

* Federal Share is fixed by National Housing Act (C-133) and Federal/Provincial Agreement (Clause 13).

Part II. Proposed 1974 Provincial Contribution to Inglewood/ Ramsay Neighbourhood Improvement Program.

Based on the guidelines that the province contribute up to 25% of the cost of NIP, the maximum provincial contribution to the Inglewood/Ramsay project would be $515,000 over a 3 year period. A maximum yearly allocation to this project would therefore be approximately $172,000. As all of the planning and implementation details have not yet been finalized, and as time will be required to work out the staffing and administrative details for the Inglewood/Ramsay project, it is not likely that an allocation greater than $150,000 will be utilized during 1974. Therefore it is recommended that a grant of $150,000 be made available to the City of Calgary for the year 1974 to be used in the Inglewood/Ramsay Neighbourhood and in a manner consistant with the guidelines as contained on page 14 of this report. Upon the approval of this course of action the City of Calgary should be notified that the Inglewood/Ramsay project will be evaluated by AHC in the fall of 1974 to determine project needs in order to establish a further provincial allocation for 1975.